DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 198 802 IR 009 167

AUTHOR	Hood, Paul D.: And Others
TITLE	Studies of Educational Dissemination and Utilization: Annual Final Report of the Educational Dissemination Studies Program.
INSTITUTION	Far West Lab. for Educational Research and Development, San Francisco, Calif.
SPONS AGENCY	National Inst. of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	30 Nov 80
CONTRACT	400-80-0103
NOTE	32p.
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Annual Reports: Diffusion: *Educational Research: *Improvement Programs: *Information Dissemination: *Information Utilization: Networks: Research Utilization
IDENTIFIERS	*Educational Dissemination Studies Program: Linkage

ABSTRACT

This report reviews the 1980 activities of the Educational Dissemination Studies Program (EDSP), which is designed to (1) establish efficient means of communication for analyzing, monitoring, and communicating the status, needs, and accomplishments of educational dissemination performers: (2) increase the quality of and access to knowledge pertaining to the dissemination and utilization process: and (3) establish a participatory capacity for organizing and conducting special studies contributing to improvement of educational dissemination as a regional and nationwide effort. Two interrelated program components are described. The dissemination and utilization studies component collects, analyzes, synthesizes, and communicates information on organizational and interorganizational arrangements supporting dissemination activities, as well as on educator acquisition, assimilation, and use of new knowledge. The special studies component provides a flexible, quick response capacity to mobilize educators to examine or conduct exploratory studies in educational dissemination. Information on program planning and personnel is presented, and EDSP publications completed in 1980 are listed. (Author/FM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED198802

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

STUDIES OF EDUCATIONAL DISSEMINATION AND UTILIZATION:

ANNUAL FINAL REPORT OF THE

EDUCATIONAL DISSEMINATION STUDIES PROGRAM

Paul D. Hood
Carolyn S. Cates
Sue McKibbin

November 30, 1980

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

K.W. Harms

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

FAR WEST LABORATORY
FOR EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT
1855 FOLSOM STREET · SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA 94103

IR009167

This project has been supported with federal funds from the National Institute of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, under Contract No. 400-80-0103. The contents of this publication do not necessarily reflect the views or policies of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and the National Institute of Education, nor does mention of trade names, commercial products, or organizations imply endorsement by the U.S. Government or the Far West Laboratory.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION..... 1

DISSEMINATION AND UTILIZATION STUDIES..... 3

Interorganizational Arrangements..... 3
Knowledge Syntheses..... 6
Information Base..... 11

SPECIAL STUDIES..... 15

Inquiry Into Information Equity Issues..... 15
Alternative Organizational Perspectives..... 17
Conference Support..... 20

PLANNING..... 23

PERSONNEL..... 25

EDSP PUBLICATIONS COMPLETED IN 1980..... 27

OTHER REFERENCES..... 29

SIGNIFICANT EVENTS (Fourth Quarter Only)..... 31

JAN 16 1981

INTRODUCTION

The Educational Dissemination Studies Program (EDSP) has three general objectives: 1) to establish efficient means for analyzing, monitoring, and communicating the status, needs, and accomplishments of educational dissemination performers; 2) to increase the quality of and access to knowledge pertaining to the educational dissemination and utilization (D&U) process; and 3) to establish a "participatory" capacity for organizing and conducting special studies contributing to improvement of educational dissemination as a regional and nationwide effort.

To accomplish these objectives, the EDSP is comprised of two interrelated program components: 1) Dissemination and Utilization Studies and 2) Special Studies. The first component contributes directly to the NIE Program on Research and Educational Practice by collecting, analyzing, synthesizing, and communicating information on: a) organizational and interorganizational arrangements supporting D&U activities, and b) educational practitioner acquisition, assimilation, and use of new knowledge. The Special Studies component, which directly addresses the third EDSP objective, provides a flexible, quick response capacity to mobilize scholars, experts, and practitioner leaders to examine or conduct priority D&U problem definition, analysis, or other exploratory studies.

This annual final report reviews activities of the Educational Dissemination Studies Program for the period December 1, 1979 to November 30, 1980.

DISSEMINATION AND UTILIZATION STUDIES

Three types of dissemination studies are now in progress. The first examines institutional and organizational arrangements and personal linkages between organizations, in order to provide a more comprehensive understanding of how various types of educational organizations work together in accomplishing school improvement programs.

The second type of study employs nationally prominent scholars to synthesize and integrate the results of previous studies, to suggest fruitful areas for further research, and to provide guidance for practice improvement action.

The third type of study concentrates on collection, organization, and analysis of published qualitative and quantitative information relating to educational knowledge production, dissemination, and utilization.

Interorganizational Arrangements

The purposes of the study can be described figuratively as 1) exploring and mapping the territory of formal dissemination and utilization linkages among educational organizations, and 2) piloting conceptual and descriptive/analytic frameworks for interorganizational arrangements.

The objectives are:

- To identify the variety of interorganizational arrangements that support school improvement efforts.
- To identify, describe, and analyze examples of predominant types of interorganizational arrangements in terms of their history, context, structure, operations, and outcomes.
- To examine the nature and extent of key factors that influence the establishment and continuation of effective interorganizational arrangements.
- To identify and assess present and potential strategies for establishing and continuing effective interorganizational arrangements.

During the first quarter of FY 1980, three activities were completed: preparation of a preliminary analysis report; a meeting of EDSP staff, advisory panel members and NIE staff to review and critique the preliminary report and the preliminary study design (submitted November 1979); and outline of the revision of the preliminary analysis report and the study design based on suggestions from the advisory panel.

The preliminary report was based on a review of approximately 40 interviews with individuals in state, intermediate, and local educational

agencies who are involved in school improvement programs and/or intra- or interorganizational arrangements which support school improvement efforts. The report highlighted state-, intermediate-, and local-level perspectives; presented brief descriptions of twelve arrangements; and identified several issues or themes raised in the interviews.

In reviewing the study design, the advisory panel concluded that the design was much too ambitious. The panel recommended that the preliminary design should be considered as a general framework, and that the immediate focus should be substantially narrowed. Four specific recommendations were made: 1) the emphasis of the study should be on providing analytic descriptions of interorganizational arrangements (IOAs) that support school improvement efforts; 2) a complementary emphasis should be on describing the California School Improvement Program (CSIP) and the IOAs associated with CSIP; 3) the current effort should not focus on types of organizations per se but on the IOAs that are formed by these organizations; and 4) a contingency plan should be developed for the possibility that CSIP would be eliminated if the Jarvis II initiative for a limit on state spending were passed in the June 1980 balloting. In line with these recommendations, the study's objectives were changed to those stated above.

Three major activities were conducted during the second quarter: identification interviews in the 13 county offices of education in the Greater San Francisco Bay Area; completion of the preliminary analysis report to include advisory panel recommendations (Cates, McKibbin, and Hart, May 1980) and revision of the study design (Cates, May 1980).

A total of 59 interviews were conducted in the 13 county offices and approximately 100 interorganizational arrangements were identified. Brief summary descriptions of the arrangements were prepared.

During the third quarter, work continued on preparing summaries of the characteristics of the IOAs and work was begun on developing a classification system for IOAs. In July, EDSP staff and visiting scholar Dr. David L. Clark met, on separate occasions, with Dr. Ann Lieberman and Dr. Jerry Fletcher. In August, EDSP staff met with Dr. Paul Berman. The primary topics covered were a review of data collected to date and advisors' suggestions about ways in which data could be most usefully organized and analyzed for the November 1980 report. The advisors' recommendations were that work during the last quarter of FY 1980 should be concentrated on: 1) developing a method for classifying IOAs; 2) describing the IOAs of each class with particular emphasis on IOA characteristics of special interest to policy makers; and 3) describing the complexity of IOAs within the thirteen county area in terms of the classification system. These recommendations represented a shift in focus that arose from two facts: 1) the number and variety of IOAs that had been identified presented much greater complexity than was originally anticipated, and 2) the state of California had just commissioned a major policy evaluation study of CSIP that would provide (much CSIP) information that the current study could use without collecting it. Accordingly, the plan for the November 1980 report on IOAs was revised along the following lines: Section I would present the background and

describe the rationale and procedures of the study; Section II would present an overview of the IOA classification system; Section III would present an overview of findings in the 13 county area, including a "census of IOAs" according to the classification system; Section IV would contain descriptions of each category of IOA. The descriptions would be a composite picture drawn from data about all the individual arrangements within each category. The report would be concluded with summary and conclusions, with special attention given to characteristics of IOAs of special interest to policy makers.

The final quarter of FY 1980 was spent in organizing and analyzing the IOA data to conform to this plan, and in writing the report, An Exploration of Interorganizational Arrangements that Support School Improvement (Cates, forthcoming). The skeletal features of the classification system and examples of distinctions between major categories are presented below.

The classification system is divided into two major categories based on the source of motivation for establishing or formalizing the arrangement. In one category are IOAs begun in response to an impetus external to participating organizations. Within this category arrangements can be subdivided into those which are mandated by state and/or federal legislation (e.g., Consolidated Application Cooperatives, Special Education Consortia) and those which are enabled but not required through external sources (e.g., Teacher Centers, CSIP Program Review Consortia). Although arrangements in the latter sub-group usually are established in response to state or federal funding opportunities for improvement efforts, enabling sources also can include county governments, foundations, or local and regional business concerns.

The other major category includes arrangements which are initiated or formalized by the member organizations without external requirements or enabling support for the IOA itself. These arrangements, which we have labeled freestanding, also can be sub-divided into two sub-groups. In one sub-group, member organizations have agreed to cooperate in order to accomplish one or more externally required improvement efforts or activities (e.g., to establish and implement proficiency assessment standards required by California Assembly Bill 65). In the other sub-group, the initiative for both the improvement efforts and the IOA has come from the member organizations (e.g., Career Education Consortia, a County Superintendents' School Improvement Consortium).

The most readily apparent distinctions between relational properties of externally motivated arrangements and relational properties of free-standing arrangements occur along the structure and operations dimensions of the descriptive/analytic framework. For example, the structure of externally motivated IOAs is more standardized because both the activities and the units and procedures for exchange are fixed by the external source, and the arrangements must meet the specifications in order to meet the mandate or to remain eligible for the external support. In addition, the type of coordinating mechanism structure usually is specified by the external source along with the duties and responsibilities of the agency or individual designated as coordinator (operations).

Knowledge Syntheses

Studies of knowledge utilization in education and in other social fields have progressed to a point where stocktaking of what is known as a result of past research, and systematic examination of the approaches used and the research questions addressed, is needed to increase understanding of what is involved in effective dissemination of knowledge for the improvement of educational practice and the enhancement of educational equity. During 1978, EDSSP completed an exploratory synthesis (Emrick and Peterson, June 1978). Based on the experience with this pioneering effort, a working group of prominent scholars was recruited in 1979 to undertake a broader synthesis.

By the end of 1979, the six contributors to this synthesis effort submitted drafts of papers that underwent subsequent revision during the first quarter in FY 1980. Brief summaries of each of the six papers follow:

House, Ernest. Three Perspectives on Innovation--The Technological, the Political, and the Cultural.

House asserts that knowledge utilization can be viewed through three screens or perspectives: technological, political and cultural. The technological perspective focuses on the innovation as a rational process of research, development, and diffusion. The political perspective emphasizes the innovation in context, resulting from conflict, negotiation, and compromise. The cultural perspective is dominated by the context, consisting of interacting subcultures and their language, symbols, values, beliefs, and social exchanges.

Research and policy implications are:

- Each perspective suggests different explanations, policies, and action strategies.
- Each perspective is a separate dimension in three-dimensional space.
- No one perspective is absolutely correct all of the time.

Berman, Paul. Toward an Implementation Paradigm of Educational Change.

A discussion and critique of the frequently used technological paradigm lay the groundwork for describing the nature and causes of a paradigm shift in which the simple and basically incorrect views prevalent during the fifties and sixties are being cast aside for more complex images of how schools respond to pressures of change. Berman proposes three meta-propositions that encapsulate a new implementation paradigm:

- Educational change is an implementation-dominant process pervaded by difficulties and ambiguity. Variation, not

replication, occurs when the innovation interacts with the educational setting into which it is introduced.

- Educational change results from three loosely coupled processes--mobilization, implementation, and institutionalization.

- Outcomes of educational change efforts are context-dependent and time-dependent.

The bases and implications of each meta-proposition are examined. The paper concludes with some reflections on future research.

Miles, Matthew. Generic Properties of Schools in Context: The Backdrop for Knowledge Utilization and "School Improvement."

The state-of-the-art of research on knowledge utilization and the generic properties of schools provides a springboard for a discussion of educational change. The dimensions of schools as social systems and the primary tasks of schools are reviewed, as are the three levels of change--maintenance, marginal change, and core change. A focal point of the paper is the discussion of nine dilemmas which emerge from the dynamic interplay between routinized school operations and change processes. Goal setting, with its observed regularities, claims, and evidence, is then discussed. Finally, two knowledge gaps are identified: the extent of practical or daily "working" goal consensus and the dimensions of the goal setting process.

Fullan, Michael. The Role of Human Agents Internal to School Districts in Knowledge Utilization.

Knowledge utilization is described, and its inherent definitional difficulties are discussed in the first section. This introduction is followed by an overview of knowledge utilization by four types of local education agency staff:

- Teachers, who have limited access to information.

- Principals, who want to contain and constrain the forces of change.

- District consultants, who can support KU activities and develop a district "infrastructure for change."

- Superintendents, who play a critical role in major system change.

Conclusions derived from the discussion are that internal district staff are the most important human agents, unique characteristics of educational settings dominate the change process, and the role of district staff in KU may be underemphasized.

Louis, Karen Seashore. The Role of External Agents in Knowledge Utilization, Problem Solving, and Implementation of New Programs in Local School Contexts.

A summary of arguments for and against the use of external agents introduces the subsequent discussion of external agent roles, goals, and functions. Ambiguities in a number of areas such as homophily, locus of internal and external agents, team or individual work, and personal characteristics of agents are then related to role performance.

Strategies for the most effective use of external agents are suggested, contingent on the following factors:

- Initiative--the energy and effort needed for the external agent to reach the client or target group.
- Intensity--the length of the agent-client relationship and the amount of time spent on it.
- Expertise--the ability of the agent to handle content or process problems.
- Scope and cost--the number of clients who can be served by the agent and the cost of such service.

Research issues revolve around a lack of theoretical frameworks, a narrow focus on a single KU function or a single type of knowledge, failure to place agents in organizational contexts, and limited research about the most effective roles, characteristics, and functions of external agents.

Sieber, Sam. Incentives and Disincentives for Knowledge Utilization in Public Education.

Chapter I of this comprehensive study summarizes recent trends, emergent themes, definitions, sources and types of incentives and disincentives for knowledge utilization. A discussion of external sources of KU incentives and disincentives follows in Chapter II, including topics such as:

- research and theoretical weaknesses
- recent findings
- unintended consequences
- alternative change models
- types of consultants and linkers
- the local context of education
- community influences on KU processes.

Internal sources for KU incentives and disincentives comprise Chapter III, which considers the following:

- generic features of schools
- role efficiency and role overload
- superordinate support, leadership, and power
- the teachers' subculture
- occupational communities
- enlightenment as an intrinsic KU incentive.

Chapter IV summarizes dimensions of local incentive systems and areas for consideration in future research and program development.

The 1980 Annual Meeting of AERA in Boston provided an opportunity for FWL and NIE staff to meet with five of the authors of the knowledge synthesis papers (Sam Sieber was absent). During the meeting a strategy for publishing the series of six papers, supplemented by an introduction, was discussed. Commercial publishers which might be interested in such an undertaking were suggested and discussed. Rolf Lehming agreed to prepare a prospectus and communicate with the publishers in a priority order agreed upon by the group. Rolf Lehming's search for a commercial publisher was successful. Sage Publications offered to publish the collection of knowledge syntheses papers in soft and hard cover publications under the title Improving Schools: What We Know.

During the meeting the authors gave their permission for FWL to send review copies of the papers to educational practitioners for their critiques. Twenty-three persons including school administrators, teachers, disseminators, and others such as state education agency consultants, FWL staff, and a local school board member, were selected and asked to review the papers. Their task was to identify what they considered to be the most useful information in each paper and to suggest alternative formats and methods of communicating this information to various audiences.

A number of themes emerged in the critique of the knowledge synthesis papers. They are summarized here.

1. School people are "tired of researchers either watering down their findings with caveats or calling for more research."

2. It is difficult to extract conclusions and applications from the material, although this step is essential in any reworking of the papers for practitioners.

3. There is too much use of jargon and technical language which does not communicate with practitioners.

4. The papers were at times considered verbose, rambling, and not well organized or presented.

5. Many reviewers suggested that the revisions highlight a few of the most useful concepts in each paper and not try to summarize all of the ideas presented.

6. Some reviewers thought that illustrative examples, case studies, or vignettes should be added to help the ideas come alive for the practitioner. "There is still too much distance between researchers and practitioners."

7. A number of reviewers were frustrated, angry, and "turned off" by the papers, all the while feeling that they contained some interesting ideas which could be useful if they were presented in a different form.

Among the audience types, the disseminators recognized more than the other reviewers the broad, thorough content and potential applicability of the papers in their day-to-day activities. Teachers and administrators tended to say that there were interesting ideas in the papers, but their usefulness to practitioners was not readily apparent. One reviewer commented, "teachers and principals do not tend to analyze the 'why' of 'what' they are doing in the classroom or school setting. 'How?' is their biggest concern, particularly of those who are trying to do an adequate job."

Based on these critiques, EDSP staff decided to prepare a "Practitioner's Guide" document directed primarily to the education dissemination community. The publication would be supplemented by "awareness" materials that would be developed in FY 1981.

During the final quarter, a draft version of the Practitioner's Guide was completed (McKibbin, Lieberman, and Degener, December 1980). The Guide focuses on three thematic threads running throughout the six syntheses papers:

- Three perspectives on educational innovation: The technological perspective; political considerations; the cultural perspective.

- Individual and organizational factors influencing educational change: The common properties of schools; dilemmas faced by schools; the rewards and punishments of educational change; moving away from the technological mindset.

- Human agents and knowledge utilization for educational change: External agents; internal agents; external and internal agents working together.

Rather than condensing or summarizing everything in all six papers, the Guide extracts the most actionable ideas for disseminators, with extensive crossreferencing to be made to the Sage publication.

In the final quarter of FY 1980, final selections were made and service agreements were completed with individuals forming two additional knowledge synthesis panels listed below.

Synthesis of Research on Dissemination and Utilization Fields Other than Education:

- Irving Feller, Institute for Policy Research and Evaluation, Pennsylvania State University
- Michael Huberman, Knowledge Transfer Institute, Washington D.C.
- Ian Mitroff, Graduate School of Business, University of Southern California
- John Meyer, Department of Sociology, Stanford University
- Robert Rich, Woodrow Wilson School, Princeton University
- Warren Walker, Rand Corporation, Santa Monica, California
- Robert Yin, Case Studies Institute, Washington D.C.

Conceptual and Methodological Problems in Dissemination and Utilization Research:

- Steve Andrews, Center for New Schools, Chicago
- Gene Hall, University of Texas R&D Center, Austin
- Judith Larsen, American Institutes for Research, Palo Alto, California
- Robert Rich, Woodrow Wilson School, Princeton University
- Robert Yin, Case Studies Institute, Washington D.C.

Information Base

This activity is a low cost, continuing effort designed to collect published qualitative and quantitative information regarding status, trends, agencies, programs, capabilities, needs, products/services, and accomplishments in the field of educational dissemination, knowledge utilization, and school improvement throughout the United States, and especially in the FWL region.

Statistical Indicators. During the previous year, EDSP published four reports (Hood, February, 1979; Hood and Blackwell, February, 1979; Paisley, Cirksena, and Butler, February, 1979; and Hood, May 1979) which provide a conceptual framework for the development and analysis of quantitative indicators of educational knowledge production, dissemination, and utilization (KPDU) and illustrate their use at three levels of analysis: regional, state, and SMSA. These analyses demonstrated that there are significant, policy-relevant differences among geographic areas at all three levels of aggregation; that contextual factors such as population, level of educational expenditure, urban density, size of educational staff, and number of educational agencies, powerfully predict many KPDU indicators based on counts; and that there are well defined patterns of relationships among KPDU indicators. Analyses at the SMSA (Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area) level demonstrated that it is possible to "pinpoint" the status, quality, and equity of distribution of education information services to various populations within states and regions.

Work in FY 1980 was especially focused on building a joint FWL-SWRL regional data base (AZ, CA NV, UT) that might be used by both the FWL and

the SWRL Regional Laboratories as part of their efforts to "map" their regions in terms of educational needs and resources.

During the first quarter two machine-readable tapes were acquired:

- American Educational Research Association (AERA) membership data tape (names deleted) identifying divisional affiliation, State and ZIP location, institution, and demographic data (to June 1979).

- California School District Achievement Test Scores (1972/73 through 1978-79) for grades 2 and 3.

A manual compilation and tabulation was completed identifying California school district involvement in four categories of demonstration/adoption: 1) exemplary practices demonstrators (77-79); 2) state funded adoptions (75-78); 3) NDN adoptions (77-78); 4) Title IV-C adoptions (77).

During the third quarter, in response to a request from CEMREL, statistical indicator data and context factor scores were provided for ten states in the CEMREL service region. Work continued on compiling descriptions of state and federally funded dissemination and technical assistance projects in the FWL region.

During the fourth quarter, a county-level data base was created containing 45 "context" indicators for each of the 118 counties in California, Nevada, Utah, and Arizona. The 45 variables were selected to provide a broad array of social, economic, demographic, educational, medical, welfare, industrial, and ethnic data describing the counties in the combined FWL and SWRL regions. Analysis of this regional data base will commence in FY 1981.

School-Based Personnel in Knowledge Utilization. In February 1980, NIE/REP staff met with 11 external reviewers to review draft documents and plans for research on the role of human resources (persons in state, intermediate, and local educational agencies) in producing, disseminating, and facilitating use of knowledge directed toward school improvement and equity goals. (See section below on Special Studies--Conference Support.) In preparation for, and as follow-up to this meeting, an extensive search of the ERIC database was made to identify significant literature describing the role of school-based personnel in knowledge utilization. Four substantive topics (clusters of related search terms) dealing with "human agents," "information," "innovation," and "change and development" were each combined with 13 school-level position descriptions (e.g., teachers, supervisors, librarians). Over 5,000 citations/abstracts were retrieved. These were screened for relevance/quality and reduced to approximately 300 items that were coded and mounted on 5x8 cards. This ERIC search effort was completed in the second quarter by ordering, screening, and analyzing the content of more than 200 documents. Further work on this task was postponed due to change in priorities that will emphasize synthesis of literature on "external" (to school) resources in FY 1981, and "internal" resources in FY 1982. Work accomplished to date will provide a useful base that can be easily updated in FY 1982.

The Role of Teachers and Other School Practitioners in Decision Making and Innovation. In tandem with the ERIC search described above, EDSP staff undertook a meta-analysis of three studies that deal in depth with the role of teachers and other school personnel in introducing educational innovations (Hood and Blackwell, August 1980). After reconciling differences among the studies, the evidence points to a probable increase in the role of teachers as innitiators of innovations (between 1968 and 1973). Data on teachers and other school district personnel as innovation initiators are shown to vary by: the job position of the informant, the size of the district, the wealth of the district, the grade level of the school, and the level of professionalism of the instructional staff. Participation of teachers in educational decision making is wide spread, especially with respect to curriculum and instruction, but involvement is usually confined to advisory or collaborative roles except for areas under the teachers' direct control. Again, there is evidence that district size, wealth, and teacher professionalism as well as school organizational structure affect levels and kinds of teacher participation.

SPECIAL STUDIES

Three special study areas were the focus of EDSP attention during 1980:

- Inquiry into Information Equity Issues
- Alternative Organizational Perspectives
- Conference Support

Inquiry Into Information Equity Issues

This continuing Special Study included four tasks in 1980: 1) review and revision of an information equity concept paper, 2) analysis of the ERIC database, 3) initiation of work on collecting quantitative and qualitative data regarding equity groups and resources in the FWL region, and 4) feasibility study of information equity "interventions."

Equity Concept Paper. Dr. Glen Harvey's draft paper, Information Equity in the Field of Education: A Concept Paper, was sent to eight reviewers who responded with oral or written critiques. The paper was then revised, published, and disseminated (Harvey, March 1980). The paper analyzes the concepts of "equality" and "equity" as they have been used in education and in other fields and develops a continuum of possible positions for each concept. The notion "information equity" is then examined, and a number of specific and general policy consequences and implications are discussed in terms of different equality and equity positions. The paper concludes with the outline of a conceptual framework for approaching information equality/equity issues in the field of education.

Database Study. A major effort in the second and third quarter of 1980 focused on an intensive examination of the ERIC database. This study carried the Paisley, Cirksena, and Butler ERIC study (1979, pp. 8-16) beyond raw counts of documents to an intensive analysis of the citations and abstracts. Four content areas were chosen: attitudes, counseling, curriculum, and employment. Each content area was searched for all ERIC documents that had been indexed as pertaining to each of five groups: physically handicapped, mentally retarded, Blacks, Hispanics, and women. For each of the twenty combinations (four content areas by five groups), systematic samples of 25 ED document citations/abstracts and 25 EJ journal citations were pulled.

The report (Hood, July 1980) presents analyses of posting data for the total journal collection (CIJE) and the total document collection (RIE) for each of the five equity groups, and also for combinations of groups with each of four broad topical areas (attitudes, employment, counseling, and curriculum). Then for each of the twenty group/topic combinations, samples of CIJE and RIE entries were selected and content analyzed in terms of a number of classifications, e.g., date of publication, page length, sex of author, sponsor. Comparisons among the five equity groups

are made on each content analysis dimension for both the CIJE and the RIE samples. The RIE data are also examined in terms of cross classifications of all pairs of content dimensions (i.e., groups, topics, publication date, sponsor, performing institution, type of publication, copy availability, authorship, number of equity groups identified, page length). This analysis demonstrates that there are a very large number of significant relationships among the dimensions. The study also conclusively demonstrates that the literature posted to each of the five groups is significantly different in terms of most of the content analysis categories.

Quantitative and Qualitative Data in the FWL Region. The California, Nevada, and Utah departments of education have provided data on school district enrollment by ethnic groups. After resolving differences in reporting methods, school enrollment totals and percentages for six groups (American Indian or Alaskan Native, Asian or Pacific Islander, Hispanic, Black, White, and Handicapped) were computed for each of the 104 counties in CA, NV, UT. These data were added to the set of "context" variables described previously as part of the EDSP Information Base.

In preparation for the Workshop on Information Equity (see immediately below), a number of persons throughout the FWL region were contacted by mail and telephone in order to identify significant information, dissemination, or technical assistance programs as resources responding to information needs of various equity audiences. Preliminary findings will be summarized in Marzone and Hood (December 1980).

Information Equity Interventions. Work in this area in 1980 was initially planned as a small-scale feasibility study of the possibility of conducting a "piggyback" case study of various information equity efforts in the FWL region in FY 1981-82. After discussing the plan with members of the California Dissemination Committee steering group (includes representatives from the California State Department of Education, FWL and SWRL Regional Laboratories, County offices, and the San Mateo Educational Resources Center) and NIE/REP staff, we concluded that there were two major problems with the planned approach: 1) defining classes of interventions suitable for study and finding examples active in the FWL region, and 2) facing up to the fact that the mini-studies would perhaps be too expensive for the EDSP FY 1981-82 budgets. However, following NIE/REP staff suggestion, EDSP awarded a small contract (as part of the knowledge synthesis activities described above--pp. 10-11) to Case Studies Institute (R. Yin) to contact a diverse set of dissemination projects throughout the U.S. and describe their approaches to serving equity audiences. This study, to be concluded early in 1981, may provide some directions for future efforts along these lines.

The California Dissemination Committee steering group did express strong interest in doing something about "equity interventions." Consequently, EDSP requested NIE/REP permission to reallocate EDSP resources to support a regional conference and workshop on information equity. After approaching several other organizations with the idea, a "Workshop on Information Equity: Disseminating Information Responsive to User

Differences" was jointly sponsored by: California State Department of Education; Department of Education, Region IX; San Mateo Educational Resources Center; SWRL Educational Research and Development, the FWL Regional Program, and EDSP. Dr. Brenda Dervin, School of Comunications, University of Washington (a participant in an NIE-sponsored conference on information equity and a reviewer of the Harvey, 1980 equity concept paper) agreed to serve as the workshop leader. The sponsoring organizations nominated persons throughout the region (California, Nevada, Utah) who were invited to attend. In the spirit of the announced topic, most of the persons accepting invitations were contacted by telephone to determine their interest, needs, and view on the topics of "information equity" and "equity in dissemination." These responses were used to design a one-day workshop to help information specialists to meet more effectively the information needs of diverse educational audiences. Topics included:

- How and why people use information and why more traditional approaches are inadequate
- How people evaluate the utility of information
- How to detect information gaps of users
- How to predict information needs (or why demographic information on users is not enough)
- How to design newsletters that communicate
- How to conduct effective interviews
- Ways to categorize information for storage and retrieval

The workshop format included presentations, demonstrations, simulations, and role playing.

Interest among FWL staff was so great that a separate workshop for 24 FWL professionals was scheduled for November 20. On the following day, 30 persons from California, Nevada, and Utah participated in the workshop. The immediate reactions of nearly all participants were highly favorable, and there were many requests that additional workshops of this kind be provided. Further information on this activity will be provided in a report (Marzone and Hood, forthcoming).

Alternative Organizational Perspectives

The 1979 FWL Summer Workshop focused on "New Perspectives on Planning, Management, and Evaluation for School Improvement Efforts" (Hood, November 1979). Followup meetings with workshop participants, held in October and November 1979, led to planning for two monographs about organizational perspectives to be completed in 1980.

The first monograph would provide an overview of traditional and new perspectives on organizations, present brief descriptions of several new perspectives, and discuss the implications of the new perspectives. Contributors to this monograph are: Lynn Baker, Indiana University, Mary Carroll, Phi Delta Kappa; David Clark, Indiana University; Linda Lotto, National Center for Research in Vocational Education; Sue McKibbin, FWL; and Karl Weick, Cornell University.

The second monograph would present logical arguments in support of neorational planning and provide a conceptual framework for neorational planning. Contibutors to this monograph are: Mary Carroll, Phi Delta Kappa; David Clark, Indiana University; Anne Huff, University of Illinois; Linda Lotto, National Center for Research in Vocational Education, and Karl Weick, Cornell University.

During the first quarter, drafts of both of the monographs were developed and exchanged among authors. Four of the authors (Mary Carroll, David Clark, Anne Huff, and Linda Lotto) met in Bloomington, IN on February 15.

On May 6-7, 1980, the authors contributing to the monograph on alternative organizational perspectives and the project's advisor/editor met in Chicago to review progress and create a final structure for the monograph. Over 120 articles which had been selected from an extensive search of current organizational literature were reviewed and divided into general subject categories, a table of contents was developed, and writing assignments were made. The authors agreed to submit drafts of the ten monograph chapters for initial editing by June 1, 1980. A draft of the second monograph on nonrational planning theory and practice was also scheduled for completion by July.

In conjunction with Dr. Clark's consultation with EDSP during the last two weeks in July, two special seminars to critique the monographs were scheduled. On July 23, CEDaR Cooperative School Improvement (CSI) Coordinators met with Dr. Clark, EDSP staff, and other Far West Laboratory staff to discuss the monographs and apply the alternative perspectives to their CSI involvement. In attendance were:

Adrianne Bank, Center for the Study of Evaluation, UCLA
Steve Bossert, FWL
Matilda Butler, FWL
Carolyn Cates, FWL
Audrey Champagne, Learning Research and Development Center
David L. Clark, Indiana University
Chet Hansen, National Center for Research in Vocational Education, USO
Glen Harvey, FWL
John Hollifield, Center for Social Organization of Schools, JHU
Paul Hood, FWL
Lynn Jenks, FWL
Ann Lieberman, Teachers College, Columbia University
Max McConkey, The Network, Inc.

Sue McKibbin, FWL
Edwin C. Myers, CEMREL, Inc.
Tom Olson, Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory
Stanley Schainker, FWL
Martha Smith, Southwest Educational Development Laboratory

The meeting was punctuated by a lively interchange and candid commentaries shared by the participants. The alternative perspectives provided a variety of conceptual lenses for interpreting the two-year history of CSI. A significant insight which emerged during the seminar was an awareness among the coordinators that, although they had attended the same CSI meetings, their interpretations of them were quite diverse. At the meeting's end there was general agreement that the day spent here in advance of their regularly scheduled CSI meeting was beneficial to all participants.

On July 29-30, another workshop was held. This time a professor and graduate student were selected to represent university departments of education administration from each state in the Far West Laboratory region.

In attendance were:

Dr. Edwin S. Dodson, Professor, Department of Educational Administration and Higher Education, University of Nevada, Reno NV

Dr. Lawrence Iannaccone, Professor, Department of Education, University of California, Santa Barbara CA

Dr. David William Quinn, Associate Professor, David O. McKay Institute of Education, Brigham Young University, Provo UT

Mr. Robert Seyfarth, Graduate Student, Education Administration, University of Nevada, Reno NV

Mr. Ed Tamson, Doctoral Student in Education Administration, University of California, Santa Barbara CA

Dr. Curtis Van Alfen, Dean, College of Education, Brigham Young University, Provo UT

The meeting was designed so that EDSP staff and Dr. Clark could pilot test the ideas in both monographs with practitioners and professors. A number of themes emerged during our discussions, among them:

- The monographs represent a significant step toward synthesizing recent organizational theory and research for educators. Because much of the literature for school administrators continues to be dominated by more traditional organizational perspectives and prescriptions, the monographs present particularly timely and appropriate alternatives.

- There was considerable interest in using the monographs for preservice and inservice education with school administrators. The documents could be used as source material for a university course in educational administration, seminars, workshops, and other staff development activities.

- Many school administrators use contingencies to respond "intuitively" to many situations, in much the same way as described by the alternative perspectives.

- School administrators want practical ideas on how to apply the new perspectives. The monographs summarize current thinking about organizations, but they do not go far enough to help administrators use the ideas to solve day-to-day problems. There was agreement, however, that the materials could be used effectively in the classrooom, supplemented by examples provided by the instructor and students.

During the final quarter of FY 1980, David Clark completed revisions and final editing of the two monographs with the assistance of the collaborating authors. Publication and dissemination of both monographs will be accomplished early in 1981. A proposal for a symposium based on the substance of the monographs has been accepted for presentation at the 1981 AERA Annual Meeting. Several journal submissions are in preparation.

Conference Support

Human Resources for School Improvement Planning Meeting. Eleven external reviewers and seven NIE/REP staff met in Washington, DC, February 7 and 8, 1980. The purpose of this meeting was to review draft documents and plans, and advise NIE/REP staff regarding research on the role of human resources (persons in state, intermediate, and local education agency offices) in producing, disseminating, and facilitating use of knowledge directed toward school improvement or equity goals. The external reviewers were: Lloyd Bond, Learning Research and Development Center; Carolyn Cates, Far West Laboratory; David Clark, Indiana University; Pat Cox, Knowledge Transfer Institute, American University; Al Evans, Education Product Center, South Carolina State Department of Education; Carol Johnson, Minnesota Teachers Exchange; Ann Lieberman, Teachers College; Karen Louis, Abt Associates, Inc.; Doren Madey, NTS Research Corporation; Matthew Miles, Center for Policy Research; and Rein van der Vegt, Bremlaan, Netherlands. NIE/REP staff attending were: Naida Bagenstos, John Egermeier, Michael Kane, Thel Kocher, Rolf Lehming, Ward Mason, and Spencer Ward.

Other conferences/meetings supported by EDSP included: EDSP Interorganizational Arrangements Study advisory panel meetings January 17-19, July 23-25, August 19; Alternative Perspectives writers meetings January 19, February 15 (Bloomington, IN), April 10 (Boston); Alternative Perspectives Seminars, July 23 and July 30-31; NWREL Seminar on Collaboratives, October 21-23 (San Francisco); Information Equity Workshops November 20 and 21.

Conferences and meetings attended by EDSP staff included: California Staff Development Linkage Conference, January 7-8 (Anaheim CA); Dissemination Networks for the 80's, the California state dissemination conference; March 7-8 (Los Alamitos CA); California Dissemination Steering Committee, March 13 (San Mateo), May 14 (Sacramento), November 12 (Sacramento); Conference on Research on Dissemination and Utilization, April 6-7 (Boston); AERA Annual Meeting, April 7-11 (Boston); CEDaR Communication Division Meeting, July 29-30 (San Francisco); California MESA Project Coordinators Retreat, August 28 (Asilomar); California School Improvement Program regional school site council members orientation meeting, November 4 (FWL).

PLANNING

EDSP staff were visited by Ward Mason, NIE/REP, January 16-19, to discuss the interorganizational arrangements study and other EDSP studies. On February 7-8, the program sponsored and participated in the Human Resources for School Improvement NIE/REP planning meeting in Washington DC (see Special Studies, p. 20). EDSP staff met with NIE/REP staff and with EDSP knowledge synthesis writers and EDSP alternative perspectives monograph writers during the AERA Annual Meeting in Boston, April 7-11. The EDSP Technical Proposal for FY 1981 was completed and reviewed internally in June and submitted to NIE June 30, 1980. NIE/REP staff review was completed August 22. Ward Mason visited EDSP September 30-October 1. EDSP response to NIE questions was sent October 14.

Supplemental knowledge synthesis activities (see pp. 10-11), which had been delayed twice due to other NIE/REP work priorities, were initiated in late 1980 and are scheduled for completion in early 1981.

On June 2-3, EDSP participated in a meeting with the Need Sensing and Program Review Committee for the FWL Educational Communication Department (James Anderson, Department of Communication, University of Utah; Susan Crawford, American Medical Association, Chicago, IL; Louis Delsol, Mendocino County Superintendent of Schools, Ukiah, CA; Diane Doe, Teacher, San Francisco Unified School District; Janice Paquette, Teacher, Livermore School District, CA; Cloyd Phillips, Community Services Agency of Washoe County, NV; Harry Reynolds, Superintendent, Sequoia Union High School District, CA; Gloria Rodriquez, San Francisco, CA.

On August 22, an NIE Institutional Site Visit was made by James Shaver, College of Education, Utah State University, Logan UT; Noel Day, Urban and Rural Systems Associates, San Francisco, and Naida Bagenstos, NIE.

Paul Hood visited NIE/REP staff to discuss details of EDSP FY 1981 work on November 17-18, 1980.

PERSONNEL

EDSP operates with a small inhouse staff that is significantly augmented by a number of nationally recognized scholars whose combined expertise and experience span a wide range of scientific and technical activity addressed in EDSP studies. Carolyn Cates led the study of Interorganizational Arrangements. Sue McKibbin coordinated the Alternative Organizational Perspectives project, which is led by Dr. David Clark, School of Education, Indiana University. Dr. McKibbin also led the work concerned with practitioner critique of reports of the EDSP knowledge synthesis writers, and preparation of a "Practitioner's Guide" to these reports. Paul Hood directed the Knowledge Base studies and the Information Equity special studies. Laird Blackwell worked on a part-time basis on the Information Base studies.

The work of the first EDSP synthesis panel (Paul Berman, School of Public Policy, University of California, Berkeley; Michael Fullan, Ontario Institute for Studies in Education; Ernest House, CIRCE, University of Illinois; Karen Louis, Abt Associates, Inc.; Matthew Miles, Center for Policy Studies, New York City; and Sam Sieber, private consultant, Virgin Islands) was concluded this year. Two new panels of scholars (see p. 11) began work late in 1980.

David Clark led the "Alternative Organizational Perspectives" monograph writing work. Other contributors to this project included: Lynn Baker, University of Indiana, Mary Carroll, Phi Delta Kappa; Anne Huff, University of Illinois; Linda Lotto, National Center for Research in Vocational Education; Sue McKibbin, EDSP; and Karl Weick, Cornell University.

The special studies on information equity have been assisted by Glen Harvey, formerly FWL, now at NIE; William Paisley, Institute for Communication Research, Stanford University; Brenda Dervin, School of Communications, University of Washington; and Jean Marzone, FWL.

Technical advisors for the Interorganizational Arrangements Study include: William Baker, Alameda County Office of Education; Paul Berman, University of California, Berkeley; Jerry Fletcher, Manifest Learning Systems, Tiburon, CA; Ann Lieberman, Teachers College, Columbia University; and William Paisley, Stanford University. Barbara Hart, University of California, Berkeley, assisted on a part-time basis.

The Program has established a technical advisory panel of scholars who have worked with EDSP in a variety of ways. The members are:

Leonard Beckum, Director, STRIDE (Service, Training, and Research in Desegregated Education), FWL

Paul Berman, Visiting Professor, School of Public Policy, University of California, Berkeley.

Milton Bins, Senior Associate, Council of Great City Schools

Henry Brickell, Director, Policy Studies in Education

Matilda Butler, Director, Women's Educational Equity Communications Network, FWL

David Clark Professor, School of Education, Indiana University

Kathleen Devaney, Director, Teachers' Centers Exchange, FWL

John Emrick, John A. Emrick and Associates, Los Altos, CA

Gene Hall, Director, Research on Concerns-Based Adoption Project, The Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, The University of Texas at Austin

Ann Lieberman, Associate Professor, Teachers College, Columbia University, and Associate Director, Horace Mann-Lincoln Institute

Donald Moore, Executive Director, Designs for Change, Chicago, IL

William Paisley, Professor, Institute for Communications Research, Stanford University, Stanford, CA

Everett Rogers, Professor, Institute for Communications Research, Stanford University, Stanford, CA

Samuel Sieber, Private Consultant, Virgin Islands

EDSP PUBLICATIONS COMPLETED IN 1980

First Quarter

No publications completed

Second Quarter

Harvey, G. Information Equity in the Field of Education: A Concept Paper (final version). (Far West Laboratory, March 1980.)

Analyzes the concepts of "equality" and "equity" as they have been used in education and in other fields and develops a continuum of possible positions for each concept. Examines the notion of information equity, and identifies and examines specific and general policy consequences and implications with respect to information equity. Outlines a conceptual framework for approaching information equality/equity issues in the field of education.

Cates, C. Interorganizational Arrangements for Dissemination and Utilization: Study Design. (Far West Laboratory, May 1980.)

The design of the EDSP study of interorganizational arrangements is described and updated in this paper.

Cates, C., McKibbin, S., and Hart, B. Organizational and Interorganizational Arrangements and Linkages for Dissemination and Utilization: Preliminary Analysis Report. (Far West Laboratory, May 1980.)

This report highlights state-, intermediate-, and local-level perspectives on school improvement and D&U arrangements related to the California School Improvement Program, presents brief descriptions of twelve D&U arrangements that support school improvement efforts, identifies seven issues or themes frequently raised in the interviews, and provides an overview of implications for revision of the study design.

Third Quarter

Hood, P. D. Information Equity Issues in Education: The ERIC Database Coverage for Five Groups. (Far West Laboratory, July 1980.)

Posting data for the total journal collection (CIJE) and the total document collection (RIE) are examined for each of five equity groups (physically handicapped, mentally handicapped, Blacks, Hispanics, and women), and also for combinations of groups with each of four topical areas (attitudes, employment, counseling, and curriculum). Then for each of the twenty group/topic combinations, samples of CIJE and RIE citations/abstracts are content-analyzed

in terms of cross classification of some or all of the following content dimensions: groups, topics, publication date, sponsor, performing institutions, type of publication, copy availability, authorship, number of equity groups identified, and page length. The analysis demonstrates that there are many significant relationships among the dimensions and that the literature for each group is significantly different from the other groups in terms of most of the content analysis categories.

Hood, P. D. "Communication Technology in the 80's: Back to Basics?" (Presentation to CEDaR Communication Division, San Francisco, July 28, 1980.)

The thesis of this presentation is that, if R&D was the driving force and the raison d'etre for educational laboratories and centers in the 70's, then communication is surely the name of the game in the 80's. Recent syntheses of studies of knowledge utilization and change efforts in education, and recent efforts to develop alternative perspectives in policy and social change areas point to paradigm shifts that will accentuate consideration of cultural and political contexts and the need for highly effective multi-level communication.

Hood, P. D. and Blackwell, L. R. The Role of Teachers and Other School Practitioners in Decision Making and Innovation. (Far West Laboratory, August 1980.)

Three studies that deal in depth with the role of teachers and other school personnel in introducing educational innovations are examined and compared.

Fourth Quarter

Cates, C. An Exploration of Interorganizational Arrangements That Support School Improvement. (Far West Laboratory, forthcoming.)

This report presents the findings of an exploratory study to identify and describe the ways in which educational organizations in a thirteen county area of California collaborate to support school improvement efforts. Included in the report are: a classification system for interorganizational arrangements (IOAs); a "census" of IOAs in the study area according to the classification system; and descriptions of the exemplifying characteristics of arrangements in each category.

Clark, D. L., McKibbin, S., and Malkas, M. (eds.). New Perspectives on Planning in Educational Organizations. (Far West Laboratory, December 1980.)

The authors of papers in this publication, Mary Carroll, David Clark, Anne Huff, and Linda Lotto, challenge basic assumptions about the management function of planning. They assert that the

currently dominant formalized planning systems are based on inappropriate representations of educational organizations. Section I argues the failure of traditional goal-based, rational, sequential planning systems and explores why they have failed. Section II discusses planning concepts and variables that better represent educational organizations and hence provide a more effective basis for planning than do traditional systems. Section III introduces alternative frameworks for thinking about the planning process through the use of metaphors and suggests some activities and guidelines that might be employed by planners interested in such alternatives.

McKibbin, S., Lieberman, A., and Degener, D. Practitioner's Guide to Improving Schools: What We Know (draft). (Far West Laboratory, December 1980.)

This publication draws highlights from six synthesis papers on knowledge utilization and school improvement. Three thematic threads found in the papers provide topics for three sections of the publication--new perspectives on educational innovation; organizational factors influencing change, such as common properties, dilemmas, incentives and disincentives, and mutual adaptation; and internal and external agents of change. Questions and short case descriptions at the end of each section apply the information to typical educational situations. A concluding section summarizes key ideas and pinpoints next steps for educational disseminators.

OTHER REFERENCES

Emrick, J. A. and Peterson, S. M. A Synthesis of Findings Across Five Recent Studies in Educational Dissemination and Change. Updated revision of January 1978 version. (Far West Laboratory, June 1978). ERIC ED 156 109.

Hood, P. D. Indicators of Educational Knowledge Production, Dissemination, and Utilization: A Conceptual Framework. (Far West Laboratory, February 1979.) ERIC ED 174 242

Hood, P. D. and Blackwell, L. R. Indicators of Educational Knowledge Production, Dissemination, and Utilization: Exploratory Data Analyses. (Far West Laboratory, February 1979.) ERIC ED 174 243

Hood, P. D. Differences Among the R&D Exchange Service Areas in Educational Knowledge Production, Dissemination, and Contextual Indicators. (Far West Laboratory, May 1979, limited distribution.)

Hood, P. D. (ed.) New Perspectives on Planning, Management, and Evaluation in School Improvement: A Report on the 1979 Far West Laboratory Summer Workshop on Educational Dissemination and School Improvement. (Far West Laboratory, November 1979.) ERIC ED 182 818

Paisley, W., Cirksena, M. K., and Butler, M. Conceptualization of Information Equity Issues in Education. (Far West Laboratory, February 1979.) ERIC ED 172 827

SIGNIFICANT EVENTS
(Fourth Quarter Only)

(See EDSP Quarterly Reports for significant events in previous three quarters.)

September 30/ October 1	Ward Mason, NIE/REP, visits EDSP to review program plans.
October 21-23	Sue McKibbin serves as presenter at NWREL-sponsored "Symposium on Educational Collaboratives," San Francisco. Portion of sessions also attended by Carolyn Cates and Paul Hood. EDSP staff meet with NWREL staff to discuss future collaborative efforts.
November 4	California School Improvement Program regional conference for school site council members hosted at FWL.
November 12	Paul Hood attends California Educational Dissemination Committee steering group meeting in Sacramento.
November 12-13	Ann Lieberman, Teachers College, Columbia University, visits EDSP to contribute to the preparation of the "Practitioner's Guide."
November 13	Roland Vandenberghe, Faculty of Psychology, University of Reuven, Belgium, and Rudolf van den Berg, Catholic Educational Center, Hertogenbosch, The Netherlands, visit EDSP to discuss strategies for dissemination and change.
November 17-18	Paul Hood visits NIE to discuss program plans with Naida Bagenstos, Mike Kane, Ward Mason, and Spencer Ward.
November 18	Paul Hood visits Marcella Pitts, CEDaR, Washington, DC, to discuss needs assessment and resource mapping activities of the laboratories/centers.
November 19	Collin Marsh, Senior Lecturer in Education, Murdock University, Murdock, Western Australia, visits EDSP to exchange information on curriculum change in the U.S. and in Australia.
November 20	Information Equity Workshop attended by 24 FWL staff members.

November 20 — Regional Information Equity Planning Session attended by Donna Bolen and Lynette Beach, California State Department of Education; Kay Palmer and Gene Robinson, Nevada Department of Education; Kenneth Lindsay and Joe Sandoval, Utah State Office of Education; Roger Scott, SWRL Research and Development; Dale Hillard, Department of Education, Region IX; Lynn Jenks, FWL Regional Program; and Paul Hood, FWL/EDSP.

November 21 — Workshop on Information Equity. Presenter: Brenda Dervin, School of Communication, University of Washington. Participants: Robert Baker, San Francisco American Indian Center; Lynette Beach, California State Department of Education; Francine Belkind, Vallejo City Unified School District; Jackie Berman, Consultant, California State Department of Education; Donna Bolen, California State Department of Education; Robert Bouchard, San Benito County Superintendent of Schools; Carolyn Cates, FWL/EDSP; Annette Conklin, Novato Unified School District; Michael Crawford, San Francisco American Indian Center; Albert Dixon, Santa Cruz County Office of Education; Martha Douglas, Office of the Contra Costa County Superintendent of Schools; Gloria Edwards, Teacher Corps, School of Education, University of California at Berkeley; Ezekiel Gilliam, Pittsburg High School; Barry Grossman, Sacramento County Office of Education; Judy Guilkey, Teacher Corps, Vallejo City Unified School District; Glen Harvey, NIE; Sandy Hawkins, Office of the Santa Clara County Superintendent of Schools; Dale Hillard, U.S. Department of Education, Region IX; Paul Hood, FWL/EDSP; Lynn Jenks, FWL Regional Program; Mitsu Kumagai, Office of the Santa Clara County Superintendent of Schools; Kenneth Lindsay, Utah State Office of Education; Jean Marzone, FWL; Sue McKibbin, FWL/EDSP; Robert Moore, Teacher Corps, School of Education, San Francisco State University; Gail Myers, Alameda County Office of Education; Mary Nur, Teacher Corps, CERAS, Stanford University; Kathy O'Brien, Harnell College; Kay Palmer, Nevada Department of Education; Gene Robinson, Nevada Department of Education; Susan Roper, Stanford/San Jose Unified Teacher Corps; Joe Sandoval, Utah State Office of Education; Roger Scott, SWRL Research and Development; Carol Smith, Alameda County Office of Education; Sid Smith, Marin County Office of Education; Nancy Tamblyn, Office of the Santa Clara County Superintendent of Schools, Judith Whitmarsh, Monterey County Office of Education.